



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

There were none with present participles. Nor can I see what there was in my footnote referring to Dr. Grimberg's opinion which should have led Professor Callaway to think that I endorsed it. I make this elaborate explanation not merely to vindicate my agreement with Professor Callaway in regard to the present participle, but to point out that he unduly ignores the importance of such passages as I have cited in contributing to the development of the accusative with infinitive. A reviewer who cannot find anything else to disagree with may be permitted so much.

All students should join the author in thanking the Carnegie Institution for the handsome form in which the work has been printed. With such an auxiliary to call upon, no person need despair who has anything of scientific value to put before the world.

JACOB ZEITLIN.

*University of Illinois.*

#### THE GREEK ROMANCES IN ELIZABETHAN FICTION.

S. L. Wolff. Columbia University Press, 1912. \$2.00.

In Wolff's dissertation evidences of assiduity are everywhere. Much actual contribution to knowledge is nowhere present—and what little new material is scattered in this volume of 482 pages has to a distinct extent appeared in two articles, one on *Robert Greene and the Italian Renaissance* (*Englische Studien*, XXXVII, pp. 321-374), the other on *A Source of Euphues* (*Modern Philology*, VII, pp. 577-585). The pseudo-scholarliness of Wolff's work may best be seen by an analysis of its content. One-half of the book is devoted to a discussion of the Greek romances themselves; and one-half of this space is given up to summaries. Of the second half of the book, the influence of the Greek romances upon Nash and Lodge is comprised in two pages, upon Lyly in thirteen, upon Greene in ninety-one, upon Sidney in one hundred and four; of the material upon Sidney forty-five pages are a summary of the *Arcadia*. That the summaries are well-done would assuredly be no defense for allowing them such vast proportions in a "contribution to knowledge."

But if the summaries are to be found in a half-dozen other works, one might at least expect that in a book which can scarcely command any audience other than busy fellow-researchists, the one hundred and twenty-six pages on the nature of Greek romance should present more than stereotyped facts known to every lecturer upon fiction—that the plot of the Greek romance emphasizes the relation of love and

adventure; that the love is purely physical though chaste and capable of endurance; that the characters are cowardly and dissimulating in general; that Achilles Tatius introduces in *Clitophon and Leucippe* coarse comic relief; that the setting is vague, save for a peculiar fondness for digressive accounts of animals, pictures, etc.; that stage terms are employed, as well as highly artificial oxymoron, antithesis, and homeophony; that, finally, the narrative of the *Theagines and Chariclea*, after plunging in *medias res*, advances and retrogresses at once, with dubious employment of suspense, whereas the relation of the *Clitophon and Leucippe* and of the *Daphnis and Chloe* is of the type called "straightforward." Most of these matters were alluded to by Amyot in 1547, by Sorel in 1627, by Scudéry in 1641—not to mention their to my mind final treatment by Rohde in *Der Griechische Roman*. New to a certain extent, of course, are Wolff's emphasis on the hieratic tone of the *Theagines and Chariclea* and his consequent distinction between the conflict of Providence and Fortune in this romance as against the rule of Fortune almost alone in *Clitophon and Leucippe* and of Eros and Fortune in *Daphnis and Chloe*. Had this material constituted the text of some dozen pages and all the remainder of the discussion been rapidly given in a half-dozen more, the author's volume would thus far be valuable to the specialist. As for the innumerable citations proving points no one would possibly contest, many might have been relegated to footnotes, many more omitted.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> If the reader think this judgment harsh, let him consider that Wolff has used so much illustrative material that he has fallen into yet another difficulty; instances of self-contradiction abound. Thus, on p. 132 we read: "the 'love-interest' is nowhere based upon a sufficiently exalted conception of love, or upon a sufficiently sound 'psychology', or upon a sufficiently profound understanding of human character, to be in itself ennobled;" on p. 155 we read of Melitta in *Clitophon and Leucippe*: "for once, his analysis is entirely appropriate, perfectly measured, and quite free from superficial rhetoric." Of yet another scene in the same work we are told: "The change of Melitta's mood, so clearly and truthfully portrayed; the impassioned eloquence and power of her pleadings; the real pathos of the situation; make the scene a masterpiece of serious, nay, almost tragic, characterization." Again, on p. 139 we learn: "Daphnis is utterly incapable of courage;" but on p. 190 his courage is ably analyzed. Finally, for any one who will read carefully may note other instances for himself, we observe on p. 132: "How this episode, so suggestive of later fiction, got into *Clitophon and Leucippe*, I cannot attempt to say. It is connected with the main plot by only the slenderest of threads, and the main action is in any case wholly unaffected by the chivalrous (*sic*) character of Callisthenes's love;" to this statement comes a direct contradiction on p. 201: "This novella is bound to the main plot by a single thread, but a very strong one: the abduction of Calligone renders impossible her marriage to Clitophon as planned, and permits the

That in the second half of Wolff's thesis there is some new material has already been stated. The discussion starts with the influence of Greek romance upon Lyly, discusses its effect upon Sidney, Greene, and Nash, and finishes with its relation to Lodge. Thereafter come three appendices, one upon the resemblances of Amyot's and Day's versions of *Daphnis and Chloe*—this appendix being of much interest to investigators of fiction; one upon the relations of the Old and the New Arcadia; one upon Burton's translation of *Clitophon and Leucippe*.

Perhaps the most serious censure of the second half of Wolff's dissertation lies in its limitation of the field of investigation. If every parallelism of incident, characterization, setting, and style in Elizabethan fiction and Greek romance is to be attributed to borrowing—and such is Wolff's attitude—, then every possible source of influence must be minutely scanned. Yet in the table of translations of Greek romance given on pages eight to ten, there is no mention of the Spanish versions—even though Underhill has devoted a "Columbia University Study in Literature" to *Spanish Literature in the England of the Tudors*; the very possible effect of the *Clareo y Florisea* (Sp. 1552; Fr. 1554; Eng. 1575) is never considered; above all, the influence of Boccaccio's *Fiammetta*, which reached Spain in 1492, France in 1534, and England in 1587, is totally ignored. The significance of these omissions for Wolff's argument may best be shown by remarking that, if no Greek romance had been known in England, either the *Clareo y Florisea* or the *Fiammetta* would have furnished, one the typical Greek plot, the other the typical Greek psychology to Elizabethan authors.<sup>2</sup> And, even, were there omissions of no importance, what of the failure to evaluate the influence of the Italian *novellieri* other than Boccaccio? Of the *Amadis*

---

successful prosecution of his love-affair with Leucippe." I repeat that, were most of this illustrative material properly condensed into notes, Wolff's meaning would be much clearer.

Incidentally, I personally should be inclined to question the attribution of the general structure of the *Theagines and Chariclea* to the struggle between Providence and Fortune; is not the constant quest of the author for contrasts between hope-arousing and dismay-inspiring adventures to be taken into consideration? Similarly, I doubt the statement that Clitophon and Leucippe had no cause to flee. In the first place, the midnight scene in Leucippe's bed-room would make most lovers want to flee; in the second place, given Leucippe's shameless advances, Clitophon could scarcely fail to attempt the midnight adventure. (cf. Wolff, p. 148.)

<sup>2</sup>I am not claiming influence for these works. I merely insist that an investigator should have considered them. Spanish novels, too, like the *Clareo y Florisea*, were in England; and Book V of the *Amadis de Gaula* shows Greek influence.

itself? In particular, of the *Diana Enamorada*, which Sidney so certainly knew, and whence, I suspect, comes more than one portion of the *Arcadia*? Surely, without proving the failure of influence from these sources, parallelisms are most hazardous.

There is yet other objection, however, to be urged against the pages and pages of parallelisms which constitute the greater part of Wolff's "borrowings in Elizabethan fiction." Nor do I wish to complain that a reader is tempted to cry out: "Had Lyly, Greene, and Sidney no imaginations? Were they masters of the *verba ipsissima* of leaf after leaf of the Greek romances?" My criticism is, I hope, more scholarly than that. What I am wary of is Wolff's clever presentation of assumption, which is not fact, and then the transference of this assumption to the world of fact. This is best seen in relation to the *Euphues*. The first fourth of the *Euphues* is paralleled to the opening scenes of the *Tito et Gisippo* of Boccaccio,<sup>3</sup> the *Tito et Gisippo* is then traced back to the *Athis et Prophilias*, the *Athis et Prophilias* is then assumed to be taken from a "lost" Greek romance.<sup>4</sup> With Sidney, Wolff is on much surer ground. He gratefully acknowledges that without Mr. Dobell's discovery of the MSS. of the old *Arcadia*, the most significant portion of his tracing of influence from Heliodorus would be impossible. For, after admission that both as regards characterization and humor Sidney owes little to Greek influence, and that as regards setting Sidney has his own manner,<sup>5</sup> Wolff elaborates upon the entire remodeling of the first version of the *Arcadia* in accordance with the structure of the *Theagines and Chariclea*; the old *Arcadia* was, it seems, chronological in order and fairly free from episodes, whereas the *New Arcadia* began, as every one knows, with a shipwreck; employed constant suspense both in the concealment of the oracle and in the insistent use of episode and reverting narrative; laid emphasis upon the contest of Providence and Fortune; introduced a vow of chastity before the elopement; and

<sup>3</sup> In the parallelism between Boccaccio and Lyly it should not be overlooked that Wolff ignores that Tito and Gisippo were friends from earliest youth, that the soliloquies of Tito and Euphues are startlingly different, and that in Boccaccio much time elapses before Tito reveals to Gisippo his love for Gisippo's betrothed. Why should Lyly have so stupidly ruined Boccaccio's admirable motivation?

<sup>4</sup> Some parallelisms of style are hinted at (p. 256).

<sup>5</sup> "The only characters directly traceable to Greek Romance are Gynecia (and) Andromena" (p. 329). "Strangely enough, too, the storm which brought about the Princes' first shipwreck does not owe anything specific to either Heliodorus or Achilles Tatius; nor does the exquisite description of the river Ladon—a lovely bit of landscape apparently Sidney's own" (p. 335).

developed greatly the device of "pathetic optics" wherever possible.<sup>6</sup> In the *Arcadia*, too, the influence of Achilles Tatius is to be reckoned with. The famous execution scenes, a number of names, the references to events in terms of the theater, the use of antithesis and oxymoron, the employment of oratory—these are with some plausibility attributed to the influence of the author of *Clitophon and Leucippe*—though it should be suggested that Sidney's style surely owes something to that diction of Montemôr's *Diana*, so curiously called *baxo estilo*, and that the *Amadis* was a treasure-house constantly rifled for all types of eloquence. What to say of Wolff's treatment of Greene furnishes a difficult problem. On the whole, were I not distrustful of Wolff's entire parallelistic method and use of assumption, I should be inclined to accept such a statement as this (p. 445): "Thus in compounding *Menaphon* Greene took something from Warner; more from Sidney, and, through him, from Greek romance; and most from Greek romance direct." In general, also, one may agree with this (p. 456): "It (borrowing) begins with mere transcripts from Achilles Tatius in *Arbasto*, *Morando*, and *Carde of Fancie*—a stage of immaturity and superficiality, which, in the main, borrows non-structural ornament. *Philomela*, which seems to fall in immediately after this group, shows Greene taking less from Achilles Tatius (only the trial at the end), and more from Heliodorus, chiefly by way of incident,—not yet by way of structure. The influence of the Greek romances reaches its height in *Pandosto*, which takes a little from Achilles Tatius, but now gets structure as well as matter from the solid Heliodorus, together with incident and ornament from the decorative Longus. The influence degenerates at once in *Menaphon* . . . flickers up for a moment in his half-realistic, half-autobiographical *Groatsworth*." It may, indeed, be well, to close this review of a book, often very cleverly worded, but always provocative of distrust of the "special pleader", by showing how little is left to other source-hunters in connection with Greene, if Wolff's account be accurate. *Via Boccaccio's* vanished sources come the first and second tales in *Perimedes* and the story of *Fabius and Terentia* in *Tullies Love*. The influence of *Clitophon and Leucippe* is seen in Greene's "Tychomania", through which Fortune is not only mentioned innumerable times, but is invoked to move the plot needfully or needlessly; in the framework of *Arbasto*, in

<sup>6</sup>I question entirely the statement (p. 338): "Pamela's description of Musidorus on horseback . . . is a palpable imitation of the description of Theagenes riding in the pomp at Delphi." Sidney's recognition of his digressions is traced—and rightly, I think—to similar passages in the *Theagines and Chariclea*.

Clinias's invective against women in the *Carde of Fancie*, in the painting of Europa in *Morando*; in the use of such names as Lewcippa, Clerophontes, Thersander, Melytta; in the rhetoric, the characterization by soliloquy or antithetical analysis, the homeophony of style. The influence of the *Theagines and Chariclea* is seen in its mention three times (*Mamilia*, II, 6, 7, 91; *Alcida* (IX, 80); in Fortune becoming inventor of theatrical situations and in the Eros motive; in the entire plot of *Menaphon*—the oracle, the shipwreck, the establishment of chastity by public trial, the pathetic optics; in the *dénouement* of the *Carde of Fancie*, of *Tullies Love*, and of *Philomela*; and in many "most certainly borrowed" incidents. The influence of *Daphnis and Chloe* is seen in the use of the pastoral as an harmonious element in the solution of a longer story; in the ridicule of shepherd life; in the management by Love and Fortune of the *Menaphon*; in the general tone and many of the incidents of both *Menaphon* and *Dorastus and Fawnia*. *Que diable allait-il dans cette galère?* May not one ask this question of the shade of poor Greene?<sup>†</sup>

University of Minnesota.

ARTHUR J. TIEJE.

<sup>†</sup>Lodge mentions Heliodorus twice (*Forbonius and Prisceria*, I, 53, 54; *Robert of Normandy*, II, 52). Nashe is uninfluenced.

LORD BYRON AS A SATIRIST IN VERSE. By Claude M. Fuess, Ph.D. Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, Columbia University Press, 1912. \$1.25.

BYRONIANA UND ANDERES AUS DEM ENGLISCHEN SEMINAR IN ERLANGEN. ERLANGEN, 1912.

Dr. Fuess's thesis is a contribution to our knowledge of two much neglected fields of English literature. Satire, particularly later English satire, receives almost as little attention from investigators as from readers, and Lord Byron, though the subject of hundreds of articles and books, has never been given the scholarly consideration that has fallen to the lot of most of his great contemporaries.

The book begins with a rapid survey of English satire from 1660 to 1809 and then proceeds to a chronological survey of Byron's poetry. It is concerned principally with the study of the influences at work upon Byron's satires. Dr. Fuess shows very clearly and in detail what students have in a general way surmised,—that Byron's early satires were modelled rather closely upon the work of Pope, Churchill, Gifford, etc., while the later, freer ones, written during his residence in Italy, were extensively influenced